



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,227	01/09/2001	Ramzi Yehia	515-A00-001	6299

23334 7590 09/14/2004

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/757,227

Applicant(s)

YEHA ET AL.

Examiner

CUONG H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Status of the Claims

1. Claims 11-13, and 17-19 are pending; claims 1-10, 14-16 are cancelled by the applicants on 5/24/2004 (claims 20-24 are previously canceled).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 11-13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedman (US Pat. 6,182,029), in view of Gupta et al. (US Pat. 6,513,059), and further in view of O'Brien et al. (US Pat. 6,311,327).**

A. As to independent claim 11: Gupta et al. disclose a method, comprising:

- linking different entities over a network to a centralized hub processing unit (see Gupta et al., 4:44-66);
- presenting a user interface for inputs (see Fig.4 - each client obviously communicates to a hub via a user interface);
- receiving orders from different entities - this is also well-known because Internet helps different entities to communicate to each other (e.g., email communication); Gupta et al. suggest about parsing text into a structured word

term, then that term is mapped back using XML tags (see Gupta et al., the abstract).

Gupta et al. do not disclose about parsing an order into a tag value, placing said tag value into a database for retrieving later, analyzing that tag value.

However, O'Brien et al. disclose that a tag would contain a tag value that is indicative of the location of the source code of the tag statement generating the tag (see O'Brien et al., the abstract). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a tag would contain a tag value that is indicative of specific order information.

Friedman obviously suggests the steps that Gupta et al. do not disclose:

- parsing an order into a tag value representing predefined fields (see Friedman, 14:7-12);
- placing tag values into a database using a naming structure that is identical to the naming structure used for the tag values (see Friedman, 14:7-12)- it is well-known to use a similar name for a component in a database in order to recognize easily; the following is an intend of use "so that elements in the database schema can be populated directly from the tag values";
- O'Brien et al. obviously suggest about retrieving related information (e.g., contract tag values) from a database (see O'Brien et al., 7:30-43, and 10:34-38). It

would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use O'Brien step in business: e.g., tag values that form a relationship between entities as determined by the tag values the order; and

- O'Brien et al. obviously suggest a step of analyzing a tag content/value and making decisions (see O'Brien, 4:9-14; and 8:20-27); and

Friedman does not disclose about sending an order to a trading partner if a condition is satisfied.

However, Gupta et al. disclose about sending a message when input information are correct, this step is similar to a step of sending an order away if it is compliant (see Gupta et al., 11:6-12).

It is obvious that said sending step only happen if tag values for the order complies with the contract tag values that form the hierarchical contractual relationship.

Friedman does not disclose about an environment with a centralized hub processing unit.

However, Gupta et al. suggest a similar environment with hub and spoke architectures (see Gupta et al., 4:59-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Gupta et al., O'Brien et al., and Friedman's teachings to suggest a business method for managing orders on a centralized hub

processing unit in a hub and spoke architecture for a multilateral environment for the benefit of parsing each received order into a predefined XML tag for easily replacement later in the whole document.

B. As to independent claim 17: It is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for managing orders on a centralized hub processing unit for a multilateral environment; this claim contains similar steps although they are expressed in computer instructions; therefore, similar rationales and references for a rejection of claim 11 are also applied based on obviousness.

C. As to dependent claim 12: Friedman obviously suggests about parsing a text into an XML tag in a database; that action is similar to parsing an order into a tag of a database (see Friedman, 14:7-12).

D. As to dependent claim 18: It is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for managing orders on a centralized hub processing unit for a multilateral environment; this claim contains similar steps although they are expressed in computer instructions; therefore, similar rationales and references are also applied (as in claim 12) based on obviousness.

E. As to dependent claim 13: Friedman suggests about parsing an order/(comprising text) into a location, that location could be a file, a document or an address .etc.(see

Friedman, the abstract. & claim 1). It is well-known that related information for said order may (inclusively/exclusively) include: a price, a quantity, a delivery date and other business terms (this language is "open-ended"); and parsing a received object into predefined fields.

F. As to dependent claim 19: It is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for managing orders on a centralized hub processing unit for a multilateral environment; this claim contains similar steps although they are expressed in computer instructions; therefore, similar rationales and references are also applied (as in claim 13) based on obviousness.

Conclusion

3. Claims 11-13, 17-19 are not patentable.
4. The attached prior art are pertinent to claimed subject matter of this pending application.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, JEFFREY A. SMITH can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Please provide support, with page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim in an effort to help advance prosecution; otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim may be considered as new matter, especially if the Application is a Jumbo Application.

Cuong H. Nguyen

CHAN
CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625